**Sample Big Questions Affirmative Constructive 2019-2020**

Do objective morals exist? When we turn on the news at night, we see images of genocide, death, humans turning their backs on each other. If this is the world in which we live, how can there be anything that we can call universal? How can there be a divine power that sets a standard for what is good with so much bad in the world? But today, I stand in affirmation of the resolution Resolved: Objective morality exists. I stand so because it is not the capacity for humans to do evil to each other but the capacity for us to do good and it is the standard for which that good is measured that creates the objectivity.

 For the debate today, I will offer the following the definitions.

**Objective morality** is defined by philosopher and professor Justin McBryer as a fundamentally universal and true ethical good that transcends all people. This differs from the subjective morality that many of us experience as it requires a set reference point for which we know there to be a right and wrong, generally seen as a divine command. Justin P. Mcbrayer, 3-2-2015, "Why Our Children Don't Think There Are Moral Facts," Opinionator, <https://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/03/02/why-our-children-dont-think-there-are-moral-facts>

**To exist** is defined by the Cambridge Dictionary as to be; have the ability to be known, recognized, or understood. EXIST," Cambridge Dictionary, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/exist>

Today, I will show that an objective morality exists through the use of three main points. The first is that social contract theory is based on an objective morality, Second, that every culture on Earth has developed a set of objective ethical norms that mirror one another, and third, the concept of making decisions and choice are evidence or an objective morality.

Before I begin, I would like to state an objective to clearly set the limits to what objective and subjective morality are. To say that within one culture or person, action X is moral but in another culture, it is immoral will not prove objectivity. This is because the concept of right and wrong that is being used is static only to the person making the statement. It would be like saying that strawberry ice cream is the best flavor ever. It is inherent to the subject of the action not the object. To be objective, we need to have a standard or a stasis point for reference. In this case, it is a universal good that is inherent to all people. Call it what you will, divine command, God, a supreme being, this stasis point must exist for us to know what right and wrong. This is because the will of said power dictates the will of good, and thus allows us to measure all actions on a scale. The closer we get to the will, the closer we get to good.

First, society and cultures around the world from the start of time have followed a similar set of moral codes. From the first wandering tribes of hunters, the monarchs of the middle ages, to our modern societies, people are born, live, and die in communities. Social contract theory would tell us that at first, these people were born into a state of nature, living in small groups or individual families. But through the idea that the whole is stronger than the parts, these groups began to merge and eventually formed into the first societies. In these societies, natural rules were established. These early civilizations realized that killing was wrong because there was strength in numbers. Stealing was wrong because then there wouldn’t be enough food for later. Burning down your neighbor’s hour was wrong because then there could be retribution. Social contract theorists would have you believe that this was due to an understanding by people over the nature of society, but it goes deeper. **Comte-Sponville, professor of Philosophy at the Sorbonne and author of numerous books in 1991 writes**  that it despite our desires for society, it was a deeper human connection to a universal and objective set of morals that lead to the stability and normalization of the first societies in the world. The ideas of killing and theft were marked as undesirable as traits as they ran concurrent to the wills of society and the nature of the community. Human civilization, without knowledge of what was good gravitated towards the good by nature. Andre, *The Brute, the Sophist, and the Aesthete: Art in the Service of Illusion*, Why We Are Not Nietzscheans, edited by Luc Ferry and Alain Renaut, p. 33-36

Second, cultures across the world have adopted similar sets of objective moral standards. In Western society, we have laws based on what we view as good and bad, right and wrong. We don’t kill, steal, lie, or commit other crimes that would harm others. If we do, there are consequences. Many of these laws are based on religious commands to the same nature. But our society isn’t special. Across the world, cultures in every part of the world have adopted the same set of standards. Neil Shenvi writes that, “It is not surprising that nearly all cultures affirm these kinds of basic ethical practices since any culture that encouraged murder, theft, and lying would quickly disintegrate. However, what is far more perplexing is the existence and persistence of altruism throughout human cultures.” Neil Shenvi - "Do Objective Moral Values Exist?," Apologetics, <https://shenviapologetics.com/do-objective-moral-values-exist/>

This kind of universality does not happen naturally. Like breathing or parenting, it is an trait that is common to humans as a species and thus constitutes a the definition of an objective morality.

 Third, because humans comprehend choice, we know there is an objective morality. AS was stated in the Matrix movie series, “All that we have is choice.” Humans crave choice. The idea that decisions have been made for us will drive us to anger quickly. Just ask any Kindergarten class when recess is cancelled. But why does this happen? What makes “choice” so desirable that we are willing to fight wars over our ability to choose leaders or start arguments over pineapple as a pizza topping? That answer is that an objective morality will always put forward a choice, for humans, even if a choice isn’t necessarily of a moral consequence. According to Erwin Chemerinsky, the concept of moral choice dictates human actions no matter the decision being made. We, as humans, are always seeking to find answers and control our lives for what we would call a moral good. In this quest to find the moral good through choice, we find objectivity. Even if the choice has no moral consequence, the idea that it may wills humans to want to be in control so that the moral decision might be reached. So, in short, our own desire to made decisions is evidence of an objective morality. Erwin Chemerinsky, Legion Lex Professor of Law at the University of Southern California Law Center, CASE WESTERN RESERVE LAW REVIEW, 1991, pp. 750-751.

 Morality is complex. The idea that there is a universal force guiding all moral actions for every person is a huge concept to grasp. But when we look at the totality of human knowledge and experience, through human history, how civilization evolved and developed, and how we make our own choices each day, we see that the very evidence for an objective morality is all around us. For these reasons, I must affirm.